

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 11 are amended. Support for the amended features may be found in the specification at pages 7, 12 and 14. Thus, no new matter is added.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution); (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because e.g. they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Won in the February 29 personal interview and March 3 telephone interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

**I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 and 17-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,513 to Prithviraj et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,529,932 to Dadiomov et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As discussed during the interview, none of the applied references teach or suggest a method for operating a Web-based management system that includes "processing the data related to the network device by at least one web object," and "providing a runtime support to ensure that the data is atomically processed per event without being interrupted," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 11. Similarly, none of the applied references teach

or suggest a data presentation system that includes "a runtime support to ensure that the web object processes events atomically so that the processing cannot be interrupted, as recited in claim 21. That is, none of the applied references teach or suggest atomically processing data by an Web object. The specification defines a Web object as a template-driven mechanism that composes Web pages through the use of objects, concurrent state-machines, events and actions within states. See, e.g., page 6, lines 5-12.

None of the applied references teaches a method for operating a web-based management system or a system that includes such an operation. The Office Action asserts that Prithviraj teaches a method for operating a web-based management system of a plurality of networked devices. As acknowledged by the Office Action, Prithviraj is devoid of a runtime support to ensure that the data is atomically processed, as set forth in claim 1, and as similarly set forth in claims 11 and 21. The Office Action, however, further asserts that Dadiomov remedies this deficiency. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that Dadiomov discloses that in a distributed transaction processing that "the operations in a transaction must be performed atomically," as such would inherently avoid corrupt or wrong data and ensure data integrity. See, e.g., Dadiomov, col. 1, lines 15-16, and col. 11, lines 19-22. This assertion is respectfully traversed.

Dadiomov does not disclose a system or method that processes data nor provides runtime support as recited in the independent claims. Dadiomov only discusses atomic processing of a distributed transaction. Dadiomov discloses a method and system for processing distributed transactions that integrate the execution of operations of a transaction on separate computers with the exactly-once in order message delivery of a message queuing system to allow the transaction operations to be performed atomically and asynchronously. When distribution transaction involves two operations to be carried out on two computers, the method and system of Dadiomov either executes both of the operations or neither of them.

See, e.g., col. 4, lines 65-67. The transactions are executed using a two-phase commit protocol. See, e.g., Dadiomov, col. 5, lines 59-61. That is, if the resource managers involved in the transactions verified the correctness of their respective requests, the application requests the transaction coordinator to "commit" to the transaction, i.e., guarantee that each resource manager involved in the transaction will later execute its requested operation, before executing the transaction. If the transaction coordinator cannot "commit," then the transaction coordinator of Dadiomov aborts the transaction and asks each resource manager to roll back as if nothing had been requested. See, e.g., Dadiomov, col. 6, lines 12-34. Thus, Dadiomov does not discuss the method of operating a Web-based management system that processes data by a Web object and provides runtime support to ensure that the data is atomically processed per event without being interrupted.

Thus, claims 1, 11 and 21, and the claims dependent therefrom, would not have been rendered obvious by Prithviraj and Dadiomov. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

## **II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Prithviraj in view of Dadiomov and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,933 to Mitchell et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicant submits that Dadiomov and Mitchell do not remedy the deficiencies of Prithviraj with respect to claim 11. Claims 13-16 depend from claim 11. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 11, claims 13-16 would not have been rendered obvious by Prithviraj in view of Dadiomov and Mitchell. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-25 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs  
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/cfr

Date: March 7, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--